

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rochelle Van Annan,) C/A No.: 6-10-1227-RBH-BHH
)
Plaintiff,)
)
vs.) Report and Recommendation
)
Stephen Garcia Law Firm LLC; George B Cauthen,)
)
Defendant(s).)
)

Plaintiff, a non-prisoner, proceeding *pro se*, files this civil action against two attorneys. Plaintiff slipped and fell at a Bi-Lo on January 25, 2008 and retained the Garcia Law Firm to represent her. According to the complaint, Bi-Lo subsequently filed a Chapter 11 bankruptcy which plaintiff claims she “was a part of”, however, plaintiff alleges that defendant Cauthen, whom plaintiff states is “from Bi-Lo attorneys”, told her she “was taken off a list, as a form was never received, therefore never sent back, I had no knowledge of this at all.” Plaintiff states that “Mr. Garcia offered me \$500.00 to settle this case as he stated he could not go into Federal Court.” Plaintiff alleges Mr. Garcia “said he would pay another attorney to send a letter or would give me the \$500.00. He also sent me to another attorney for advice. That, attorney couldn’t help me either.” Plaintiff does not state what relief she seeks, but rather alleges “I’m not sure what to do at this point, or who to turn to.”

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25, 60 U.S.L.W. 4346, 118 L.Ed.2d 340, 112 S.Ct. 1728, (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-325, (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Maryland House of Correction*, 64 F.3d 951, (1995); *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983); and *Boyce v.*

Alizaduh, 595 F.2d 948 (4th Cir. 1979). This court is required to construe *pro se* complaints liberally. Such *pro se* complaints are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir.), *cert. denied*, *Leeke v. Gordon*, 439 U.S. 970 (1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a complaint filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a potentially meritorious case. See *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980); and *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319 (1972). When a federal court is evaluating a *pro se* complaint the plaintiff's allegations are assumed to be true. *Fine v. City of New York*, 529 F.2d 70, 74 (2nd Cir. 1975). However, even under this less stringent standard, the complaint submitted in the above-captioned case is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Department of Social Services*, 901 F.2d 387, (4th Cir. 1990).

In order for this Court to hear or decide a case, the Court must first have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the litigation. It is well established that federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by the Constitution and federal statute. See *Willy v. Coastal Corp.*, 503 U.S. 131, 136-37 (1992); *Bender v. Williamsport Area School District*, 475 U.S. 534, 541 (1986). This limited jurisdiction is not to be expanded by judicial decree. See *American Fire & Casualty Co. v. Finn*, 341 U.S. 6 (1951). It is to be presumed that a cause lies outside this limited jurisdiction, see *Turner v. Bank of North America*, 4 U.S. (4. Dall.) 8, 11 (1799), and the burden of establishing the contrary rests upon the party asserting jurisdiction, see *McNutt v. General Motors Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 182-83 (1936). The two most commonly recognized and utilized bases for federal court jurisdiction are (1) "federal question," 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and (2) "diversity of citizenship." 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The allegations contained in the complaint filed by the plaintiff in the above-captioned matter do not fall within the scope of either form of this Court's limited jurisdiction.

First, there is clearly no basis for a finding of diversity jurisdiction over this complaint. The diversity statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a), requires complete diversity of parties and an amount in controversy in excess of seventy-five thousand dollars (\$75,000.00):

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between—

(1) citizens of different States[.]

28 U.S.C. § 1332.

Any state law causes of action, such as a malpractice, negligence, or other tort claim, would be cognizable in this court under the diversity statute, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, 804 F. Supp. 784, 788-791 (D.S.C. 1992), *affirmed*, *Cianbro Corporation v. Jeffcoat and Martin*, (4th Cir., November 22, 1993), 10 F.3d 806 [Table], if that statute's requirements are satisfied.

Complete diversity of parties in a case means that no party on one side may be a citizen of the same State as any party on the other side. *See Owen Equipment & Erection Co. v. Kroger*, 437 U.S. 365, 372-374 (1978). This court has no diversity jurisdiction because all parties in the above-captioned case are residents of the State of South Carolina. Hence, complete diversity of parties is absent in the above-captioned case, and diversity jurisdiction is, therefore, lacking. The plaintiff is not without a forum: she may file suit against the defendant in a Court of Common Pleas, which would have jurisdiction over a suit brought by a South Carolina resident against another South Carolina resident.

Second, it is clear that the essential allegations of the complaint are insufficient to show that the case is one “arising under the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1331. That is, the complaint does not state a claim cognizable under this Court’s “federal question” jurisdiction. Plaintiff’s allegations do not contain any reference to an alleged violation of any federal statute or constitutional provision by defendants, nor is any type of federal question jurisdiction evident from the face of the Complaint.

Even if this court were to try and construe this matter as one filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, the defendants would be entitled to summary dismissal because they have not acted under color of state law. In order to state a cause of action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that: (1) the defendant(s) deprived him or her of a federal right, and (2) did so under color of state law. *Gomez v. Toledo*, 446 U.S. 635, 640 (1980). An attorney does not act under color of state law, which is a jurisdictional prerequisite for any civil action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. See *Deas v. Potts*, 547 F.2d 800 (4th Cir. 1976)(private attorney); *Lucarelli v. Norton*, 2006 WL 709319 (M.D. Pa. 2006)(unpublished)(attorneys performing their traditional functions will not be considered state actors solely on the basis of their position as officers of the court citing *Angelico v. Lehigh Valley Hosp.*, 184 F.3d 268 (3rd Cir. 1999) and *Polk County v. Dodson*, 454 U.S. 312, 318, 102 S.Ct. 445, 70 L.Ed.2d 509 (1981) (“[A] lawyer representing a client is not, by virtue of being an officer of the court, a state actor ‘under color of state law’ within the meaning of § 1983.”)); *Barnard v. Young*, 720 F.2d 1188, 1189 (10th Cir.1983) (“[P]rivate attorneys, by virtue of being officers of the court, do not act under color of state law within the meaning of section 1983.”); *Limehouse v. Delaware*, 144 Fed. Appx. 921 (3d Cir.2005)(private attorney for the opposing party could not be held to be a state actor because there were no facts which established any agreement between the attorney and the state actors to violate the plaintiff’s civil rights; a private attorney’s representation in a court case, sitting alone, does not act under color of law when performing his function as counsel).

Finally, although it is clear that the plaintiff seeks advice as to how to proceed, under Article III of the Constitution of the United States, federal district courts, such as the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, have jurisdiction over cases or controversies, and can not issue an advisory opinion.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Court dismiss the complaint in the above-

captioned case *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process. See *Denton v. Hernandez, supra*; *Neitzke v. Williams, supra*; *Haines v. Kerner, supra*; *Brown v. Briscoe*, 998 F.2d 201, 202-204 & n. * (4th Cir. 1993), *replacing* unpublished opinion originally tabled at 993 F.2d 1535 (4th Cir. 1993); *Boyce v. Alizaduh, supra*; *Todd v. Baskerville, supra*, 712 F.2d at 74; 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)[essentially a redesignation of "old" 1915(d)].

s/Bruce Howe Hendricks
United States Magistrate Judge

June 14, 2010
Greenville, South Carolina

The plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); see Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 10768
Greenville, South Carolina 29603

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).